DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 374 679 FL 022 464

AUTHOR Irby, Janet
TITLE Hierarchical Collaboration in the Revision of Text: Constructing Perceptions of Editorial Conferences in the News Laboratory.
PUB DATE Apr 94
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 4-8, 1994).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; *Dialogs (Language); *Discourse Analysis; Editing; Higher Education; Interviews; *News Writing; *Revision (Written Composition); Self Esteem; Speech Acts; *Teacher Student Relationship; Writing Processes

ABSTRACT

This study of editorial conferences in a university news laboratory examined the connections between dialogues about revision and the interpretations of dialogues by reporters and the editor in this journalism culture. The editorial conferences of two reporters with varying experience in publication and employment settings were analyzed, and the analysis was triangulated with interviews. In addition, seven other reporters were interviewed in order to interpret the editorial conferences as meaning-producing events in this culture. In order to describe the degree of engagement of reporters in conference dialogue, the discourse was analyzed for topic initiation and elaboration and speech acts, including elicitation, response, reaction. The cases and interviews suggest that collaboration and negotiation facilitate construction of alternate text choices and socialization of students in this discourse community. However, student interpretation of the editorial conference varies across four factors: the appropriateness of disagreement, the nature of the writing process, the objectives of the lab, and the degree of self-confidence of the learner. (Author/JL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 374 679

Hierarchical Collaboration in the Revision of Text: Constructing Perceptions of Editorial Conferences in the News Laboratory

by Janet Irby
University of Washington

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Janet B Irby
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association
New Orleans
April, 1994

Partially funded by a grant from the Quill and Scroll Foundation

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FL022464

ABSTRACT

This study of editorial conferences in a university news laboratory examined the connections between dialogues about revision and the interpretations of dialogues by reporters and the editor in this journalism culture. I analyzed the editorial conferences of two reporters who vary in their experience with publication and employment settings, triangulating that analysis with interviews. In addition I interviewed seven other reporters in order to interpret the editorial conferences as meaning-producing events in this culture. In order to describe the degree of engagement of reporters in conference dialogue, I analyzed the discourse for topic initiation and elaboration and speech acts, including elicitation, response and reaction. One reporter with five years experience on high school and university newspapers had a greater facility with and understanding of the collaborative nature of the reporter/editor relationship than the other who had no previous experience in a scholastic newsroom. The cases and interviews suggest that collaboration and negotiation facilitate construction of alternate text choices and socialization of students in this discourse community. However, student interpretation of the editorial conference varies across four factors: the appropriateness of disagreement, the nature of the writing process, the objectives of the lab, and the degree of self-confidence of the learner.

In the Middle of the Dialogue

In a college news laboratory the instructor and student reporter sit at a computer terminal working on the final revisions of a story for publication in a local weekly newspaper. The story is about the rights of residents when a neighbor's property presents a health and safety hazard to the community.

> Reporter: If this man has violated housing and land use laws, you want to know how to collect damages from him. You have to file a civil lawsuit and you have to file it under nuisance law, generally.
> Instructor: These people don't want to collect damages. They just want to get him to clean up his property.
> Reporter: Well, this neighborhood doesn't, but I'm assuming that somebody else might want to. And if they did want to, how would they go about doing that?
> Instructor: OK. I think you need to say something like that...you need to introduce that idea. You are switching here from the violation of the law to the civil recourse you have. Let's see how you can word that. (Elaine/Marjorie final edit, 3/8, p. 3)

Once they agree on the content to be added, the instructor points out the need for transition and begins to type in new wording for the text with the student reporter looking on.

Opportunities for Learning in Editorial Conferences

In this editorial conference, the student reporter verbalizes her thinking behind the text, the instructor shares her ideas, and the two work together on editing. In the process, the reporter participates in important talk that allows her to construct rationales for text choices as well as have a voice in the decisions about her story. However, not all student reporters in laboratory settings have the opportunity to collaborate with their editors in the editing process, due to time constraints, role definitions, and organizational routines. As a result, a reporter may lose opportunities to construct, apply, and modify journalistic concepts, and, more importantly, may miss being socialized into editor/reporter relationships that insure the reporter's collaborative role in editing stories for publication (Clark & Fry, 1992). This problem can be mediated in news laboratory[1] settings as instructors, editors and reporters talk together about revisions[2] of stories, leading to constructive learning and a shared ownership of text. Thus, in this study I investigated the nature of the talk in editorial

---

[1]By news laboratory I refer to any educational setting where one of the primary goals is to produce a newspaper or stories for publication under the guidance of a qualified instructor.

[2] Revision includes the systematic and global process of "reviewing" as well as the more automatic changes implied in the term "editing."(Hayes & Flower, 1980)

conferences and the conditions that socialize reporters into an active negotiation of text with the instructor who in this case was also the editor. More specifically, I asked the following two questions:

- how does editorial conference dialogue about revision reflect the active construction of meaning by both participants?
- how is editorial conference talk about revision interpreted in this culture?

An understanding of the hierarchical collaboration of instructor/editor and student/ reporter is important for journalism educators as they create learning experiences that will initiate student reporters into the journalism culture as well as teach them to write effectively for publication. It is my intent through a comparison of two case examples of editorial conference revision and their context to 1) explore patterns of interaction in editorial conferences that facilitate learning in the lab and 2) tie those patterns to the range of interpretations expressed by participants.

A Framework for Interpreting Conference Talk

In the News Lab, the setting for this study, the editor/instructor and student reporters follow a routine that includes the use of computers as well as face-to-face conferences for instruction, feedback, and revisions. Following is an outline of the steps in that revision process.

- the reporter files the first draft of a story on the computer.
- the editor evaluates the text and types in comments on the story in all-caps.
- the editor and reporter have a conference at the computer, discussing the editor's comments.
- the reporter processes the comments and revises on the computer.
- the editor evaluates the text again and may move through another round of comments and revisions with the reporter.
- during the final editing conference the reporter sits next to the editor at the computer screen once again and they work through the final revisions of the text together, with the editor putting in the changes.

The editorial conference comes, then, at several points in the revision process as a way for editor and reporter to dialogue about the revisions for the story.

The Hierarchical/Dialogic Continuum : From one viewpoint the reporter and editor are working out a social relationship in editorial conferences, a relationship that reflects the editor's authority and the student's role as a learner and reporter. Traditionally, editors and reporters have had clearly defined chains of command in news rooms that reflect an assembly line metaphor where the reporter receives an

assignment, completes the story, and the editor polishes before publication (Lee, 1937). Within this framework reporters have been concerned for their autonomy-- their ability to choose the focus of stories and be free from editorial meddling. Two national surveys of media professionals that cover the decades of the '70s and '80s (Johnstone, Slawski, & Bowman, 1976; Weaver & Wilhoit, 1986) indicated that control by management is on the increase. In addition, the most recent study reported that amount of feedback from supervisors and degree of autonomy ranked second and third as indicators of job satisfaction for journalists 40 or younger (Weaver & Wilhoit, 1986).

Subsequently, practical manuals for newspaper professionals have promoted more of a collaborative relationship-- a shared authority over the text. Giles (1987) states that the editor's job is to help the writer achieve balance between clarity and style, not to be the "slasher" or the controller of the text (p. 472). Clark and Fry (1992) emphasize that ideally the editor is a coach who should never take control of the story away from the reporter because "the reporter knows the story, and stealing control can lead to inaccuracies and distortions," (p. 14).

Similarly, researchers in the field of language, composition and rhetoric as well as education have been concerned with the ability of writers to have a voice within their communities (Anson & Forsberg, 1990; Bartholomae & Petrosky, 1986; Freire, 1973; Onore, 1989). A strictly hierarchical relationship of student /reporter and instructor/editor may mitigate against empowerment of individual voices. Ede & Lunsford (1990) found that a hierarchical mode of collaborative writing-- defined as "carefully, and often rigidly structured, driven by highly specific goals, and carried out by people playing clearly defined and delimited roles" (p. 133)-- was predominant in workplace settings. As mentioned earlier, the industrial age model of reporter/editor roles would fit this definition, with the editing stage solely in control of the editor. This mode is contrasted with a dialogic model of collaboration which is "loosely structured and the roles enacted within it are fluid: one person may occupy multiple and shifting roles as a project progresses," (Ede & Lunsford, 1990, p. 133). Within the hierarchical framework, "the realities of multiple voices and shifting authority are seen as difficulties to be overcome or be resolved,"(Ede & Lunsford, 1990, p. 133). In contrast, those organizations which value dialogic collaboration see the shifting voices of authority as a benefit in the writing process. A face-to-face collaborative relationship of editor and reporter would fit this description. In the News Lab, reporter/editor relationships could be placed on a continuum where the authority of the editor does not preclude the active participation of the student reporter in decisions

about text. The definition and limits of these roles are explicitly and implicitly played out in all aspects of the culture, including editorial conference dialogues.

The Instruction/Production Continuum : In addition to the organizational roles of instructor/editor and student/reporter, another set of competing paradigms overlap in the lab and parallel the learner's movement toward self-direction. Students may view the lab through the lens of a traditional classroom model where the teacher is the expert in the field whose word is not questioned, the person who must also evaluate students and give them a grade (Schwegler, 1991). In this paradigm, the student's role is to follow directions, to receive the knowledge of the field as presented by the instructor (Freire, 1973), and to apply this knowledge to the writing task. Fox (1990) claims that this "studenthood" keeps many of his students from having a more dialogic relationship in the freshman English classroom because they have learned "appropriate" behavior in school contexts. As the instructor/editor in the News Lab presents journalistic principles and conventions and applies them in the editorial conference, students may not feel it is appropriate to present alternative viewpoints. Grow (1991) describes a similar type of teaching in his second stage of self-direction where a teacher explains and justifies concepts and the student is motivated to follow the teachers' demonstrations of competency and practice skills under close supervision. He puts most industry training programs in this category and points out that a good teacher "challenges them (the learner) to become involved, to participate, to take risks, and to move on to a higher level of self direction," (p. 59) Whether this classroom model is viewed as a philosophical stance for the teacher or a developmental stage for the learner, the student's role within this paradigm is still the same- to take direction, to ask clarifying questions, and to try to carry out the suggestions of the editor.

However, overlaid on this traditional classroom paradigm is the fact that students are producing stories for publication. They are learning to be reporters who must take initiative in finding, researching, and writing stories, just as they would in a professional newsroom. This initiative includes questioning and negotiating with sources, colleagues, and editors. At this higher level, which Grow calls stage three, the learners are "weaned from other-direction" and begin to see themselves as "co-creators of the culture that shapes them," (p. 59). The reporter's active involvement in a more collaborative framework should be evident in the initiation of topics for discussion, in asking questions, in providing rationales for text choices, and in offering alternative viewpoints to those of the instructor/editor. When the reporter disagrees with the editor, the talk may take on the character of a hierarchical negotiation where she defends her text choices. This involves:

- actively using one's own ideas and skills in revising the text
- persuading the other to use ideas and wording for the text.
- finding grounds for "mutual assent" (Erickson, 1986, p. 139)
- within implicit assumption of editor's authority.

This process of negotiation is a skill that journalists need to learn as they become increasingly socialized into the profession, one that builds confidence in their own voices and enacts the benefits of multiple viewpoints in producing text. If the editor's suggestions do not fit with the reporter's background knowledge and mental model of the text, the negotiation process allows the editor and student reporter to resolve that conflict and modify their ideas, a process that involves global revision and the restructuring of journalistic concepts.

The Benefits of Verbalization and Negotiation: Thus the role of reporter and editor as well as the instructional paradigm enacted and perceived by participants in the culture may interact with the nature of the dialogues in editorial conferences--affecting the degree to which reporters actively negotiate the text and actively construct the conventions and principles valued by the discipline. Journalism educators need to understand the context for negotiation and active construction of meaning so that they can provide optimal learning environments for their students. The value of opportunities to verbalize one's ideas as a part of the writing process has been promoted by a number of researchers (Englert, Raphael, Anderson, Anthony, & Stevens, 1991; Gere & Abbott, 1985; Scardamalia, Bereiter, & Steinbach, 1984; Vygotsky, 1978) Whether one sees the editorial conference in the traditional classroom paradigm or more of a work environment, goal-driven verbalization aids in the cognitive construction of meaning by both participants (Johnson & Johnson, 1979; Webb, 1982).

This is especially important in the News Lab as reporters apply concepts and solve problems that have no right answers (Schon, 1983). Paul (Paul, 1987) claims that most problems have a conceptual dimension that is not easily defined. "The result is that the problem's precise identification and definition depend upon some arguable choice among alternative frames of reference." (Paul, 1987, p. 128) In the dialogical exchange people learn the skill of examining the alternative choices in solving a problem and they build a repertoire of experiential knowledge. In addition, through the dialogic interchange, learners are able to pull out and apply their concepts, in this case journalistic principles, restructuring them to incorporate the new ideas or experience. This process involves a "high level" of constructive activity and "knowledge transformation" (Chan, Scardamalia, & Bereiter, 1992; Scardamalia & Bereiter,

1987). Finally, as students dialogue they learn to move away from egocentric views of the process. The dialogue is not for the purpose of preserving one's voice-- or proving one's viewpoint. Rather, it is through the talk that new meaning is discovered by all participants, "a mutual or cooperative search for a fuller grasp of what is so...leading to discovery, not victory," (Paul, 1987, p. 140). The development of alternate claims and rationales for text choices as well as the discovery of creative solutions to text problems says to the learner that global and stylistic decisions in composing are complex processes that have a contingent nature.

Summary of Framework : This conceptual framework for collaborative revision includes the participants' interpretations of their roles in the News Lab and their interpretations of its learning culture. The editor/instructor and student/reporter engage in modes of interaction which reflect and continue to create interpretations of editorial conferences as events. These modes of interaction may include the active involvement of the learner in the collaborative process or the more passive reception of the editor's modeling and directions, thus serving as indicators of the extent of constructive learning and the degree of socialization of a student reporter into the journalism community. In addition, these individual and collective interpretations are continually evolving as participants in the Lab enact their roles and thus their writing activities.

A Method for Reading the News Lab

The News Lab is a culture that can be read and interpreted in the ethnographic tradition, and that tradition requires a clear presentation of practical and philosophical decisions about method. Those decisions include:

- a rationale for the choice of setting and participants
- the selection and collection of data sources
- the approach to data analysis

News Lab Setting and Routine : The News Lab is the third in a series of required courses for journalism majors in an undergraduate program at a west coast university. The class involves students as reporters for a news bureau that serves 25 local newspapers. The present director and editor of the Lab is a former city desk editor from an area daily newspaper. She is called the editor, even though she fulfills the role of instructor for the fourteen students and the role of manager of the lab. The student reporters are close to being professionals since client newspapers will pay a small amount for each story that is published. In addition to the revision process, the routine of the News Lab includes the creation of story ideas from permanent beats,

discussions of story assignments with the editor, and research and writing of stories. I chose to study the interactions in editorial conferences after the first draft of a story was filed since the conference is a required event in the lab culture as compared to more informal discussions of plans for stories.

I have selected this news laboratory for a number of reasons. First, it provides a combination of classroom instruction, laboratory experiences, and professional production demands, a learning atmosphere that promotes the intersection of declarative knowledge, practical skill, and contextual application. Within this environment, student reporters have a chance to collaborate with a professional during editorial conferences and learn the critical thinking skills that are necessary in professional life. Second, the news lab accentuates the traditional hierarchical atmosphere of the newsroom with a professional editor rather than a student editor in charge. This professional editor is a bridge between classroom learning and the workplace that will approximate the relationships new reporters will have with editors on the job (Anson & Forsberg, 1990). Finally, the News Lab needs to be described in order to understand more fully why editorial conference talk takes the shape it does and to provide case data for theories about learning in journalism lab settings (Shulman, 1992). Only in that way can journalism educators begin to construct a systematic understanding of meanings in local journalism laboratory classrooms and in the broader journalism culture. The search is for "concrete universals" that are only revealed in the detail of case study (Erickson, 1986, p. 130).

Participants : As subjects for case studies, I chose two reporters who represented different backgrounds but would also be prone to active collaboration and negotiation with the editor. The first student, Alex, had been involved in journalism since the 10th grade and had worked for the university student newspaper going on two years when he took the News Lab as a junior. In addition he indicated in the screening that he had disagreed with the editor in the writing of one of his first stories[3]. The second student, Elaine, had no previous experience other than required journalism courses; however, she, too, indicated a disagreement with a teaching assistant in the Lab on one of her first stories. A senior, she also had traveled abroad and worked for a Law Office part time, providing other dimensions of experience in different environments. The conferences I observed for Alex and Elaine provide

[3] Student reporters indicated their tendency to disagree with an editor in their answers to the open-ended question: "Tell me about a story you just finished for the Lab. Describe the interaction you had with either of the editors. To what extent did you talk the story through with others or work it out on your own?"

contrasting examples of different types of talk, a contrast that was tied to their perceptions of revision in this context.

The other important participant is the editor, Marjorie. She has operated the lab for three years and has maintained the basic routines of previous editors, balancing an agenda of practical group instruction and individual conferences as students produce stories for local newspapers. A second editor is the teaching assistant, a first year doctoral student who has had previous experience as a student in a news lab at a midwestern university. Even though he did not participate in the case studies, student reporters did refer to their interactions with him as well as the editor in the follow-up interviews.

Data Sources and Data Collection : For this study I used a combination of methods from cognitive psychology, discourse analysis, and ethnography to look at the editorial conference talk in the larger context of collaborative revision activities. I followed the revision process of one story with two reporters and the editor of the news lab, focusing my unit of analysis on the talk in editorial conferences.

After the reporters filed their first drafts on the computer, I tape recorded modified think alouds with editor and reporters as they worked on the text. Think alouds usually involve prompting participants to tell the researcher what they are thinking as they do their work (Hayes & Flower, 1980). The think alouds in this study were modified in that I did not excessively interrupt the editor or reporters as they worked at the computer. Instead, I asked them to stop and tell me what they were thinking as they completed each revision or comment they made. While the modified think alouds did not bear directly on editorial conference talk, they provided triangulation and context for interpretations of the talk. Next, I tape recorded the editorial conferences where the editor and reporter talk about the editor's comments and the reporter's revisions. The number of conferences for one story varied depending on deadline pressures and the complexity of stories. At each conference and think aloud, I collected copies of the story in its present form to follow as I observed. I also numbered in sequence the different parts of the story that were discussed or revised so that I could follow the progression of the dialogue on the tape. After tape recording think alouds and editorial conferences, I conducted semi-structured interviews to follow up on the revision process, but I left the interviews open-ended in order to discuss the conference events. I also asked participants about their interpretation of the revision process in this culture in order to understand the "unofficial, informal dimensions of role and status" (Erickson, 1986, p. 126) as they

relate to editing conferences. In order to avoid prejudicing the editor, I saved my interview of her until the case studies of revision had been completed.

Cases of editorial conferences must also be seen within the larger culture of the News Lab. Therefore, I observed several class sessions, especially those bearing on the roles of the editor and reporter, in order to better understand the shared meanings of this community. Then at the end of the course, I conducted semi-structured interviews of the six other student reporters in order to place the case studies in a broader cultural perspective of editor/reporter revision in the lab.

These methods did limit my ability to see the range of talk exhibited by different types of students in the Lab. My cases were verbal people who negotiated their text, even though one of them did not recognize the need to negotiate and did not feel it was appropriate. I also captured one conference with the editor and this second reporter that did not include negotiation. However, my data do not include examples of people who never negotiated. Overall then the emphasis will be on case studies of students who were self-confident enough to negotiate.

Data Analysis : My first step in analyzing data was to summarize each day's data collection, using an analytic memo that reflected my initial conceptual framework. In this memo I summarized significant findings, including quotes, a process that helped me focus on the patterns of talk in the conferences. The next step was to analyze transcribed data. First I identified three conferences, one of Alex's and two of Elaine's. Within these conferences I then identified topics discussed, the initiators of those topics, and the amount of elaboration by each participant based on numbers of words, coming up with a percentage of talk for each participant (Burnett, 1991).

After this analysis, I worked out a coding scheme for the editorial conferences. In order to capture the interconnected nature of the talk, I used Sinclair and Coulthard's (1978) analysis of classroom discourse to identify patterns of questions, responses, and reactions in the conferences. Then within that structure I came up with types of talk that were reflected in the data. This schema resulted from repeated attempts to define the patterns, to find language to describe what was happening, especially verbs, and to try out that code on pieces of data (Pettigrew, Shaw, & Van Nostrand, 1981). Over a three week period I tried out several versions of the code until I came up with one that worked. What I gained in this process was a language to describe what I saw in the conference transcripts, language which "accounted for underlying social functions,"(Clark, 1985, p. 180).

The next step in my analysis was to code the interviews to identify key topics or themes and the range of viewpoints related to that topic. Therefore, not all the data

was coded, but only passages that related to the themes. In doing this I edited the quotes, taking care not to change the meaning but to eliminate unnecessary or repetitive words and miscues. Finally, I had my participants read the case studies and share their interpretations of the events. This led to changes in wording to modify my interpretations as well as discussions of differing interpretations and the implications for the development of theory and practice.

News Lab Portraits- Alex

In his first editorial conference on the tobacco sting story, Alex doesn't waste time talking with the editor of the News Lab about the minor changes he has made. Instead, he launches right into a discussion of a change he does not want to make. In her comments on his draft, Marjorie, the editor, had questioned his use of the word "warning" to describe the first offense and fine of $100 for store owners who sold tobacco to a minor. Alex explains to Marjorie, "The warning is about taking their license away and they still get fined, so is that considered a warning?" Then Marjorie elaborates on her written comment.

"I don't think a fine is considered a warning," she says. "I think a warning is when you get a parking ticket and they let you off and say, 'Don't do it again.'" But Alex continues with his explanation, overlapping her next sentence.

> It's a warning against, you know how you get a first warning about taking your license away and then, the second time you get your license taken away. That's, that's what the warning is all about. (Alex and Marjorie Edit, 2/12, p. 1)

Then, after Marjorie accepts his definition, he takes the initiative in suggesting a new sentence and the two of them compose together.

> A: I could just say, "A warning, a warning is issued, uh...
> M: Yeah, "a warning."
> How 'bout, "a hundred dollar fine, uh, if they do sell and are caught..."
> A: They get penalized a hundred dollars, or
> M: (She types.) They are fined a hundred dollars and warned that subsequent
> A: and warned
> M: violations
> A: will result in
> M: could result in losing their license
> A: for a period of time
> M: suspension of their license.
> A: suspension of their license (Alex and Marjorie Edit, 2/12/93, p. 1)

Halfway through Alex's quarter in the Lab, he has no problems letting Marjorie handle his story. "It's like playing one-on-one basketball with someone that's better than you," he says.

> I play with my brother and he's always been better than me and I've been getting better because I play against him. ...If I'm around people who are my skill level, that's not going to help me as much as if I'm around someone who's been at a professional paper. (Alex Interview, 2/18/93, p. 11)

Alex knows about playing at his own skill level. He joined the student newspaper staff his freshman year at the university coming from a high school newspaper where he was editor. At first he said, "Okay, I'll just sit quiet while the editor reads my story and I'll see what changes she makes." And in that first year his leads and stories were reworked a lot. But as he progressed he began to say, "This is my story. I'm going to plead my case to these guys, these editors." Now, he says, the editors know him better and trust him as a writer. Most of his stories go in as is. The editors say, "Alex must mean it that way. This must be what he wants to say. Let's leave it." But he knows that the News Lab is at a different level and that a job as a reporter would be at a higher level of expectation again. "I'm taking suggestions from people who have been there."[4] He and the editor play ball together in a working relationship where he has choices, but he knows if the editor insists on changes, he will make them.

Part of the game is to read the comments that Marjorie has typed into his story on the computer in all-caps, and then to work through the revisions and further research that is suggested. While waiting for his turn in Marjorie's office, he chose to complete the simple style changes- the spelling of "suspicion," the comma in "1,500," the punctuation of "Ave." Then in the conference he leads the way in checking his changes-"There was "style" here. You wanted a comma there. You didn't want me to spell that out?"- pausing after each item for her response. (Edit, p. 2)

Then after this checking, he initiates the next topic by referring to Marjorie's comment which reads,

> IT SEEMS TO ME THAT SINCE THESE KIDS ARE TOLD NOT TO LIE, THE STING ISN'T VERY REALISTIC AND ISN'T APT TO CATCH MANY MERCHANTS WHO WOULD SELL TO KIDS...DID YOU ASK ZEMANN ABOUT THIS POSSIBLE PROBLEM? (Sting Draft, 2/11/93, p. 2)

---

[4] (All quotes in this paragraph are from Alex Interview, 2/18/93, p. 5)

Alex starts out the discussion by agreeing with this comment and by offering to call Zemann. "That seems like a good question," he says. But, once again, almost in the same breath he begins to present his rationale for keeping the story the way it is. And each time Marjorie counters with "yes, but" he acknowledges her point and then continues to share his evidence.

> A: Zemann mentioned to me all the time that he doesn't want them to lie.
> M: Yeah, I can understand why he wouldn't, but on the other hand it seems like it's...
> A: He wants to give them a fair shot at being able to apply the law...
> M: But it's not really very realistic...
> A: Yeah, that's true. I mean what he says not to do is say something like, 'Oh my ID's in the car...' something like that. (Alex and Marjorie Edit, 2/12/93, p. 2)

Marjorie even begins to imagine the type of response Alex might get from Zemann if he goes back to confront him. But Alex follows her line of thinking and counters with what he thinks Zemann will say.

> A: By just talking to him I can assume that he would say something like, "When we first started, we were doing the same thing eight or nine out of ten people were being caught. Now just maybe two, an average of two now, so things have gotten better." ...He's not trying to increase buys. He's trying to increase...
> M: So he's not trying to catch them, he's trying to increase awareness.
> A: Right, right. I don't know if that will make sense to the average reader.
> M: Yeah.
> A: I can still call him up.
> (Alex and Marjorie Edit, 2/12/93, p. 3)

Alex knows that in this game of joint editing he does have an important contribution to offer. He no longer has to sit and listen quietly, the way he did his first year at the *Beacon*. After all, he says, the editor is working on ten other stories with individuals in the course, and the reporter knows the story a lot better than the editor does. But he still respects her role by deferring to her judgment on the "reader", a move that illustrates his internalization of an evaluative monitor. However, even though he is getting better at imagining how Marjorie would evaluate the text and completing revisions before submitting his draft, he still feels that he has a blind spot when he is close to a story. He can evaluate other stories, but he says over and over that he can't see these holes in his own stories. This is why he needs Marjorie. On the Sting story, he just skipped over a hole like that-- "the kid's" motivation-- because he already knew why Tommy[5] was involved.

---

[5] Pseudonym for the subject of his story.

This issue of Tommy's motivation for participating in the sting was Marjorie's major suggestion for revision, which she had typed in at the top of his story.

> WHAT ARE THE KIDS' MOTIVATION FOR DOING THIS? ARE THEY PAID? DO OTHER KIDS AT SCHOOL KNOW HE'S AN INFORMANT, AND IF SO, DOES HE GET ANY FLAK FOR IT?...EXPLORE TOMMY'S FEELINGS ABOUT DOING THIS-- IS HE A LAW-AND-ORDER FREAK, AN ANTI-SMOKING CRUSADER? (Second Draft, 2/11/93, p. 1)

Then in the conference, when Marjorie brings up this important topic, Alex says, "There's not much there." This leads to a long narration of his difficulties getting information from Tommy. How he makes the boy nervous when he's in the store during the sting. How the boy clams up whenever he pulls out his note pad to interview him. How Tommy is just doing his mother a favor because she works with Zemann. How Tommy wants to avoid any publicity so that his friends don't bug him. In the end Marjorie asks him to call the boy up and see if he can get enough information to add a small paragraph about the boy's motivation. As he tells these experiences to Marjorie, he works through some of the material he could add to the story.

> A: We went in Tommy's area of the city and so when a place gets the reputation of a place to buy tobacco, then all the kids go there. Then Zemann gets on his horse and says, "This is the place to buy. We better go and check it out." Then when they know they're stinging them and coming by, they change their practices and all of a sudden it's not a place to buy anymore. And Tommy's friends say, "Well who was with him?" and that was Tommy. "Well, let's get on Tommy and give him a hard time."
> M: So his friends do know he does it.
> A: Yeah. He said if the story is to be published in North Town, don't use his name. So I'm trying to be sensitive to that. If I get too into describing him, then his friends will say, "That's Tommy." (Alex and Marjorie Edit, 2/12/93, p. 11)

As Alex gives reasons for not being able to get information on Tommy's motives, he relates pieces of the story that he has not included in the written text and the rationale for those choices. In the process, Marjorie fills in her own background on the story behind the story and modifies her suggested plan.

When the conference is over, Alex does get another interview with Tommy, and adds the paragraphs about Tommy's motivation at the end of the story. While this addition does not provide a new angle for the story as Marjorie had hoped, it does fill in a hole that Alex had not recognized before the conference.

> Tommy initially became a volunteer because his mother works with Zemann at the Health Department. But now, Tommy is participating for other reasons as well.
>
> "When you go out, you don't know what to expect," Tommy said. "The cashier's reaction is different every time. It makes it exciting-- the feeling you get by doing what's right." (Final Draft, 2/12/93, p. 4)

Alex doesn't mind these changes- filling holes, reworking paragraphs, or moving things up or down in the story. But the one thing that he wants to keep is his lead. Marjorie brings it up.

> At 15 Tommy G. is already an old pro.
>
> He's not a whiz at driving, or playing basketball or even playing Street Fighter II-- at least not yet. Tommy is experienced at enforcing the law designed to keep tobacco products out of the hands of other kids his age. (Final Draft, 2/12/93, p. 1)

She questions the fact that the lead doesn't relate intrinsically to the story. But Alex gives his rationale- that it contrasts Tommy's involvement in these stings to other activities that 15-year-olds would normally be good at. Marjorie says it really isn't a big problem, but that she would prefer a scene with him actually going into a store.

At this suggestion Alex begins to envision a major revision. "That takes so long to explain that scene," he reasons. He has carefully crafted his present lead to capture the reader's interest and provide a quick transition into the story. For him the lead is a "creative writing type of thing" that puts pressure on him to write well. If the editor wants to change it, he takes that personally. "That's me," he says. "I'm throwing myself into the story in the lead.." In the end Marjorie honors his choice, and he is relieved.

For Alex the editorial conference is a learning experience, one that may be different for each person in the lab.

> If their past experience is just talking with a teacher about an essay, it's a little different. For me, since I've had that experience then I move along to the negotiating process. I know what going over a story with an editor is like, so I don't know if that makes me able to be more bold. It just makes me more knowledgeable of what that can do for the story, how it can improve the story. But in the long term, how it can help me, because I've seen that help. (Alex Interview, 2/18/93, p. 13)

In summary, Alex is actively involved in constructing and negotiating the text with Marjorie, especially in the first half of the conference. This involvement is evident in his initiation and elaboration of topics- he initiates six of the sixteen topics

and talks over half of the time (53% of total words in conversation). His involvement is also evident in the types of questions, responses, and reactions in the dialogue. He is engaged in

- explaining why he doesn't change the text
- suggesting alternate wording
- composing with the editor
- checking his style changes with her
- countering Marjorie's suggestions with background information, and rationales for text choices.
- using his evaluative monitor
- verbalizing ideas for the text
- modifying Marjorie's ideas for the story.
- choosing to keep his version of the lead

Not only is Alex actively involved in constructing and negotiating, he identifies himself as a person who is an experienced student journalist, which includes an understanding of the collaborative relationship with an editor. His metaphor for the editorial conference suggests that he is an active learner- playing one-on-one basketball with his skilled editor. From his perspective, this activity includes using his own expertise about the story, relying on Marjorie to help him read more objectively, "pleading his case" in negotiations, and protecting the part of the text that expresses his creative voice.

News Lab Portraits- Elaine

In contrast to Alex, Elaine has not experienced the need for negotiating her stories with Marjorie. Up until the development of her comprehensive news feature[6], Elaine has found editorial conferences with Marjorie to be fairly straightforward. Like other inexperienced reporters, she was "terrified" at first to see the comments on her stories. She remembers thinking, "Oh my God, she's going to rip my story to shreds,"(Interview, 3/10/93, p. 5). But then she realized that Marjorie was suggesting ways to tighten and shorten-- ways to improve her style, and while still a bit intimidated, she learned that she needed the editor as an objective reader of her story. "I assume that the comments she gives me would be something that somebody reading

[6] A "comprehensive news feature", also called an "enterprise story", is a longer story or package of stories that takes more in-depth reporting, about an issue or problem in the community that does not necessarily have an immediate timely peg. The story package often includes a main story that gives an overview of the issue and at least one smaller or related story called a sidebar that takes some aspect of the main story and expands it.

the story for the first time doesn't understand." (Interview, 3/10/93, p. 3) Usually, she would only have one brief edit on each story with style changes but never any comments that asked her to change the intent.

Then in her comprehensive story-- a package with two profiles of community residents whose properties were safety hazards to the city and a main bar about a city amendment to deal with the problem-- she runs into the complexities of multiple, complementary stories. In the first edit, she and Marjorie participate in a collaborative give and take to sort out the problems with the package of stories.

> E: I didn't know if it was a newsworthy thing or not. And so I tried to tackle it from the perspective that I should put something in there that was timely for the 'why are you writing it now' as opposed 'why not later.' And there isn't any reason to write it now.
> M: Well not all stories need a timely angle. As long as it's going on now. As long as it wasn't a problem two years ago or five years ago and it's no longer a problem. I think it's still timely if it's still a problem. What I was concerned about is...how serious is the problem?
> E: ...See there's a lot of houses that get condemned all the time...and declared unfit for human habitation but nobody lives in them...These are owner occupied... and they're not as frequent. They probably have 15 or 20 cases a year.
> M: Oh that's quite a few. (First Edit, 2/24,93, p.1)

Then, Marjorie continues to ask a number of questions to fill in her own knowledge of the story, and Elaine responds with information from her research. Woven in with this pattern, Elaine asks Marjorie to give her expert journalistic opinion with questions like, "Is it an interesting enough story?" (First Edit, p. 2), or "On the side bar, what am I supposed to focus on?" (First Edit, p. 3). This leads into lessons by Marjorie on the journalistic merits of the story or the definition of a side bar. The session is an example of the complementary areas of expertise that editors and reporters share in conferences (Clark & Fry, 1992). In addition, Elaine constructs her reasons for her original text, the background knowledge from her research, and her plans for further research and additions to the story.

But a week later, after totally rewriting the story, Elaine is faced with the fact that Marjorie sees problems with the main bar of her story. The beginning of her story reads:

> In medieval England, a man's home was his castle. As a land owner, he was free to hide behind the castle walls, wage war with neighboring estates, exploit his surfs and beguile fair maidens. And the law said that was all right. He owned the land, and his property rights were inviolate.
> Today in this state, a man's home is still his castle-- even if it's a dump.

> The law says that you can force people to pay property taxes, forbid them from engaging in illegal activities on their land, and prosecute them if they violate the law, but you can't make them take out the trash.
>
> As residents of NW 59th Street have discovered, a man is still free to hide behind the castle walls and use his land as he sees fit. In the case of John Lynch, he is free to collect garbage and debris on his property until he poses a health or safety threat to his neighbors. (Neighbor Trashes Neighborhood, Draft 5, 3/8/93)

Marjorie feels that the lead gives the wrong impression: "I think you're kind of missing the point up here. You can force a person to take their garbage out...if it reaches a certain stage," (Elaine/Marjorie Second Edit, 3/8/93, p. 1). Elaine, however, wants to emphasize the fact the even though the city could come in and clean up the property and force the man to pay the bill, it can't keep the problem from recurring. Marjorie wants her to qualify her assertion by emphasizing "as long as you are not endangering the health of someone else..." (Second Edit, p.2), a qualification which Elaine has already included in her introduction of Lynch, but one which Marjorie feels is buried in the story and distorted by the angle.

As the two pursue their different viewpoints, however, they discover some new content for the story that may help to clarify the issue of what neighbors can do. Marjorie asks, "Is nuisance law different from the housing code?" and Elaine explains that it is different and that neighbors need to use the nuisance law to file a civil law suit if they want to collect damages, (See introduction, p. 3 for dialogue). At that point Marjorie realizes that these distinctions and the actions that community members can take should be clarified in the story.

However, the dialogue ends abruptly with no resolution when a colleague comes in to talk to Marjorie and Elaine has to leave for work. By the next day Elaine adds a few changes to respond to Marjorie's view of the story.

> ...The law says that you can force people to pay property taxes, forbid them from engaging in illegal activities on their land, and prosecute them if they violate the law, but **it's really hard to make them take out the trash.**
>
> As residents of NW 59th Street have discovered, the law still says a man is protected by his castle walls-- **until he poses a hazard to his neighbors.** (Draft 6, 3/9/93)

Later Elaine and Marjorie continue to view this negotiation in different ways. Marjorie feels that Elaine just didn't want to put more work in on revamping the approach she had taken. "I think Elaine was running out of patience." (Marjorie Interview, 3/15,93, p.2) While Elaine agrees that she was tired of the story and didn't want to put in more work on it, she also feels that the intent she had for the story was at stake.

> When we were talking about the introduction to the story, um, that was important to me and I was willing to sit and do that one out tooth and nail because I felt that then at the point that my editor was trying to change the focus of the story or trying to lesson the impact of what I thought the impact of the story should be... I was willing to fight for that one..." (Elaine Interview, 3/10/93, p. 14)

Elaine has always respected Marjorie as more of a teacher than an "editor in the field"-- a guide who "wants you to see what you've done wrong and to be able to fix it and identify that the next time around" (Interview, p. 19). For her the main purpose of the conference is to receive help in polishing the wording and tightening sentence structure, and she revises based on the editor's comments. But she differentiates between the direction she receives in the comments and her authorship of the basic content and organization of the story.

> I don't think that it would be fair to say that they (editors) share in the production of text. I don't think that most stories reflect the editor's ideas. I think that most stories reflect the reporter's ideas with the editor's comments on how to make the reporter's ideas more clear. (Interview p. 12)

So Elaine has an idea of her role in the Lab. She has always seen Marjorie as the authority who can be trusted to make the best judgments about her stories, while not taking the ownership of the story away from her.

Yet, the "Neighbor Trashes..." story presented her with a new experience. For the first time she says she had an interest and passion about a story and she realized how it can become very "personal" to a reporter, leading to negotiation with the editor.

> I can see where that (taking the story personally) could happen and if you had to talk to your editor, it's sort of an exposing thing. It's hard to work with someone that critiques your writing..Maybe I learned that you take it all with a grain of salt. (Interview, p.18)

Compared to Alex's one editorial conference, Elaine's two conferences summarized here represent contrasting modes of dialogue-- one more collaborative and instructional, the other more of a negotiation. In the first she is involved in

- asking questions
- providing background information for Marjorie
- stating her rationales for the original text, and planned changes
- committing to revisions

In the second she spends her time countering Marjorie's critique and rationales. Taken together, Elaine introduced four topics while Marjorie initiated five. But the predominate speaker in the talk was Marjorie with 62% of the total words spoken. The timing of the two types of conferences suggests that instruction may be most beneficial in the early stages of revision while prolonged disagreement during negotiation may be precipitated by deadline pressure. Both Elaine and Alex tried to hold on to elements of the text that Marjorie wanted them to change partly because they did not want to make major revisions close to deadline. In addition, with the completion of her comprehensive news feature, Elaine moves toward a deepened awareness of what triggers disagreement in editorial conferences and her own vulnerability when she develops a "passion" for a story. However, she still protects her concept of authorship and doesn't feel that the writer should have to negotiate a story with the editor. While Elaine is moving toward an understanding of the complexity of the editing process, she does not yet have the metacognitive awareness that Alex does of the collaborative nature of journalism and the creative and meaning-making potential enacted in editorial conferences.

The Larger Context

While the editorial conferences examined here illustrate some of the ways that two reporters and one editor actively construct the text and their social relationships, the stories of Elaine and Alex suggest a range of interpretations of these conferences within the News Lab culture. While all participants in this community do not share the same meanings, several themes emerge as factors that influence the level of constructive learning and socialization of students in this learning culture:

- the appropriateness of disagreement
- the individual or collaborative nature of the writing process
- the overlapping instruction and production objectives of the Lab
- the development of self-confidence

The range of interpretations on each of these themes suggests that the process of learning and assimilation into the journalism community is a complex rather than a linear one.

Appropriateness of Disagreement: First of all, participants have different views of the appropriateness of disagreement in editorial conferences. Greg, Lisa, and Elaine said they did not negotiate-- did not use their own ideas and skills, trying to persuade the editor, and finding grounds for assent. One of these, Greg, said that he did not feel a need to disagree. "Marjorie is so much more experienced than me, that I

just basically decided well, she's probably right." (Greg Interview, 3/2/93, p. 6) He did remember one time when he suggested that Marjorie's placement of information in a story would lead to an inaccurate impression, and she agreed to change the organization. Greg's view of negotiation didn't stop him from active dialogue, however. According to Marjorie,

> He was real good about explaining why he was doing things: 'I got in trouble with this and this is what I was trying to do here. I'm not real happy with the way it turned out. Maybe you could help me think of a different way to do this.' (Marjorie Interview, 3/15/93, p. 25)

This anecdote presents some evidence that an absence of negotiation does not necessarily preclude active construction of meaning in the conference. Perhaps Greg communicated enough with Marjorie all along the way that negotiation of differing viewpoints was not necessary.

On the other hand, Lisa, did not feel that she negotiated with Marjorie because she didn't think it was appropriate.

> This is a learning experience and I should speak out more, but it's just an academic setting for me and she's the teacher and I would never argue what a teacher says. They're always right to me. I needed a little longer and then I would have felt comfortable negotiating. I hadn't come to a mutual thing...(Lisa Interview, 3/4/93, p.8)

Lisa added that it wasn't until she heard Marjorie's lecture on the relationship of editor and reporter three-quarters of the way through the course that she began to realize that she should stand up for her stories more. Like Lisa, Marjorie did not think that negotiation was appropriate. The word "negotiation" to her suggested a relationship between colleagues which is inappropriate for the editor/student roles in the Lab. She liked the idea that she and the reporters were "collaborating to make the story conform to what's considered good journalistic writing. And something that they can still feel is their writing and not my writing." (Marjorie Interview, p. 19) In addition, she felt that negotiation happened when collaboration failed, suggesting as in Ede and Lunsford's (1990) paradigm of hierarchical collaboration that disagreement is a problem to be overcome and even avoided in this context. For Marjorie, the word "negotiation" took on the connotation of an argument between the editor and reporter, a situation where the participants are intent on winning rather than cooperating (Paul, 1987).

Some of the other students, Mike, Carl, Ian, Kevin, and Alex, feel comfortable negotiating. Mike felt he was more at Marjorie's "mercy" in the first conference, but

"in the final edit, nearly all the time is spent in final negotiations because there will be one or two final points she has to make...and I'll say, 'You're right you should take that out, or no I think that should stay,'" (Mike Interview, 3/8, p. 8). Carl said that he sees the relationship as give and take. "If I don't believe what she's saying or if I don't believe that her remarks are justified, then I will try to explain why I did it a certain way, hoping that I will prevail," (Carl Interview, 3/3/93, p. 16) But Carl along with others emphasized that the editor is persuasive and has the final word. "It can be mutual, but I also think that if the editor has a substantial point and then you disagree, it's pretty much the editor's decision." (Ian Interview, 3/10/93, p. 9) A few students had very clear ideas about their right to stand up for their text if they disagreed with the editor. Some referred to making sure that something they want "goes in" the story, even though they may have to find a way to "fix what was wrong." (Ian, p. 10 and Kevin, p.8) Finally, Alex reflected the view that the editor is not always right -- "what she says is not always the law" (Alex Think aloud, 2/12, p. 4)-- but that the disagreement comes up within the context of a working relationship of trust and mutual respect.

View of Writing Process: While we could place each Lab participant on a continuum of viewpoints about disagreement, a number of other factors interact with these viewpoints making interpretation of editorial conferences a complex phenomenon. A student reporter's assimilation into the journalism community involves a realization that journalism is a collaborative as well as individual endeavor. Several students in addition to Elaine did not identify with the view that the reporter shares production of the story with the editor. Kevin, who was the least experienced of the participants, said that "the ideas for the article and most of the writing come from the person who creates it. There's just a little bit of interaction and as you get better, less input comes from the editors," (Kevin Interview, 3/9/93, p. 8).

The view of the reporter as artist also fosters the idea of the editor as a coach and guide (Clark & Fry, 1992) rather than collaborator. The day that Carl told me he needed to go out and smoke so that he could prepare to defend his story, we talked outside about his impatience with writing for the weekly newspapers in the Lab. He felt that he had to write "down" to them and this was difficult because for him every word was like "an artist's brush stroke." Carl also felt that the purpose of the conference was to have Marjorie approve his story.

> I've never viewed it as a conference to improve my writing. When I present something for editorial review, it's very close to being publishable. (Carl Interview, 3/3/93, p. 12)

This view of the conference emphasizes the individual accomplishment of the writer. Similarly, Lisa saw the process of reviewing comments in the editorial conference as a reflection of her competence and skills. "It's kind of like going to the putting range. For every good ball you hit, you've got to hit about ten bad ones," (Lisa Interview, 3/4/93, p. 13). Her metaphor once again emphasizes the individual rather than collaborative process. Even Alex had talked about the part of his story, the lead, which was more of a personal creative expression.

Contrasted to this view of writing as individual performance, a number of participants spoke more about the collaborative nature of editorial conferences. Brian said on the one hand that the negotiation was one-sided because Marjorie has the experience and he doesn't. But he said in another part of the interview that he knew more about the story than Marjorie and that his job as the reporter was to make sure his vision for the story was not lost. He also mentioned that if students can learn not to react defensively to the editor's comments, the conference can be a collaboration- "a joint venture," (Brian Interview, 3/15/93). Marjorie described a frequent occurrence where students would explain their reasons for their text choices, and she would be able to help them modify their ideas. She found that they had often misinterpreted what they had been told by a previous teacher, and she was able to help them continue to evolve their concepts of journalistic principles (Paul, 1987). Ian explained that negotiation was usually about style or the meaning of the story. In his description, he implies the collaborative nature of the process as he tried to find a way to take Marjorie's critique and work out a new solution to the text problem.

> She's suggesting some changes...as far as making the story easier to understand... Most of my negotiating was explaining what this change would mean to the story and then finding something else that would be appropriate to fix whatever was wrong. (Ian Interview, p. 10)

Brian, Ian, Mike and Alex all seemed to express more of an awareness of and appreciation for the collaborative relationship between student reporter and instructor editor in the Lab, with Alex and Brian both expressing the idea that two people working together are better than one. Marjorie described the editorial conference in this way:

> I think they learn that it's important to talk about things. That there are different ways of looking at the same information...You're learning that you're not always right. (Marjorie Interview, p. 30)

In the process of learning this lesson, however, those who have held the belief that writing, even in the News Lab, is a form of individual performance and expression may struggle with the joint ownership of the process implied in the editorial conference (Irby, 1992b). When Elaine came up against Marjorie's comments on the inaccurate impression of her "Neighbor's Trash Neighborhood" story, she was willing to fight "tooth and nail." As Paul says she was experiencing this dialogue as a "battle, not as a mutual or cooperative search for a fuller grasp of what is so," (Paul, 1987, p. 140). After what seemed to be a standoff, as mentioned earlier, Elaine did go back and make several changes in her story in response to Marjorie's arguments, but she saw these as minor concessions. She did not change her lead which portrayed the subjects of her story as Lords of their manors.

Overlapping Learning Paradigms : A third factor in the interpretations of editorial conferences is the fact that some students see a traditional classroom framework for the News Lab while others see a newspaper production/newsroom framework, suggesting once again a continuum of socialization into the journalism culture. Greg, Lisa, Marjorie and Kevin all said that the purpose of the conference is learning. More specifically, Lisa felt that the purpose of the conference was to "learn our strengths and weaknesses," (Lisa Interview, p. 14) a view that is more reflective of the traditional writing classroom than a production classroom (Schwegler, 1991). She added that each story she wrote was leading to her grade. While this emphasis on the traditional classroom was also reflected to a certain extent in the attitudes toward disagreement, one student, Mike, felt comfortable negotiating with Marjorie but he was still concerned about playing the game of pleasing her, finishing his ten stories, and receiving a good grade.

> There's this sort of use of the system...by giving the editor, not necessarily the story that's the best for the public or your audience but the best for the editor...You're just trying to get to where they like what you're writing." (Mike Interview, ps. 10-11).

Mike is an example then of a student reporter who is comfortable negotiating but whose view of his relationship to the instructor/editor is limited to his role in the "system."

On the other hand Mike along with Carl, Ian, and Brian expressed purposes for the editorial conference that also reflected the newspaper production paradigm. Ian, Alex, Mike and Brian talked about having Marjorie read their stories as a "reader" would. Ian, Carl, Kevin, and Alex also spoke of learning to deal with editors and to

build a relationship with them. Brian, Mike and Carl all felt part of the purpose of the conference was to prepare stories that could be published. Finally, Elaine said that the purpose of the final conference was for the editor to check final changes with the reporter-- almost a reverse approval process.

> The purpose is so Marjorie can have me there to ask if there's any questions... 'Could I put this word in here?' ...They don't ever change the story without your consent. (Elaine interview, p. 10)

Students definitely have to balance two worlds in the Lab- that of the classroom that includes frequent lectures and quizzes- and that of the newsroom where students fulfill beat assignments in the city, formulate story ideas, report in to write or enter stories into the computer, and collaborate to send stories out for publication. The confusion happens as the two paradigms meet in the editorial conference-- the teaching, learning, evaluation paradigm and the newspaper production paradigm. Experienced students such as Alex are able to combine the two as is suggested in Grow's third stage of self-direction (1991) and see the conference as a collaboration that also is a learning process.

Building Self-Confidence : Finally, a factor that differentiates students' development in the Lab is their degree of self-confidence. Some students identified this trait in the older students in the Lab. Lisa said that both of the older students, Deborah and Carl, viewed the editorial conference differently from her.

> Deborah had said "Marjorie has never criticized me"...Maybe Deborah's just a great writer and she never gets criticized, but what I think is what she takes from Marjorie isn't criticism. What she takes from Marjorie is more that editing thing...whereas I would take it as a personal criticism... (Lisa interview, p. 19)

Similarly, Carl mentioned that he was "confidant" enough to talk to the editor if he did not agree with something. But he felt that his give and take with Marjorie did not include an "argumentative" attitude. "Having been in the business world for a long time and being in a hierarchy as we are up there, I think that that could be very destructive," (Carl, p. 15). Carl was also most frequently named by most reporters and Marjorie as the person who negotiated his stories with Marjorie.

In addition to the life experiences of older students that contribute to self-confidence, a second type of experience that is coupled with journalistic knowledge is that of working in journalism cultures. While Ian had worked his senior year on his high school newspaper, Greg had worked for one quarter on the *Beacon*, and Lisa

had completed a summer internship with a local community newspaper, Alex was the only reporter in the study who had worked on both his high school and college newspapers, adding up to almost five years of experience. He recognized these experiences as an important factor in his development as a journalist and used them to talk about his sense of self-direction as a reporter. "A lot of times an editor will say, this lead doesn't work, or I don't like it that much. You either have to take that with a grain of salt and go on with it or you've got to say, this is what this person thinks, let me change it," (Alex Interview, p.2) While I have no objective measure of his learning compared to other students, he saw growth in his ability to have a voice on the *Beacon* staff, and he connected that to his ease in negotiating his stories with Marjorie. Coincidentally, of the three stories and three reporters I followed for case study data, Alex's is the only one to be published, to date.

A third factor in building confidence is the reporter's knowledge and skill as a journalist. Kevin realized that at the beginning of the quarter he "had to be led by the nose" (Kevin Interview, p. 2), identifying himself as the "most ignorant" in the class (p. 3). When he read a comment on one of his stories he just thought to himself, "This is what you need to do," and he eagerly would pursue further research or revision. For Lisa, the confidence to negotiate her stories with Marjorie did not come until the end of the course. She tended to blame herself if Marjorie asked her to change something.

> Did I think that was an important quote? My vision of the story gets a little skewed and...I have to realize that it's her opinion and I may not always be wrong. I'm starting to realize that sometimes looking back at some stories, sometimes I put them (quotes) in there and I thought I had a good reason to put them in there. And that reminds me to just say something. (7)

For Lisa, as with other reporters, having the confidence to "say something" to the editor about text choices involves recognizing the "good reason" or rationale for that choice. These reasons and rationales are a part of the developing critical judgment that contributes to the reporter's confidence. Similarly, Ian used his critical skills to decide whether or not to make the revisions suggested by the editor or to complete revisions of his own. "I wouldn't make a revision if I didn't think it was right. I make changes if I want the story to flow differently...Or I'll throw in a quote somewhere that they didn't see the first time." (5) This application of his journalistic skills illustrates a confidence and self-direction that comes with increasing knowledge and experience.

Taken together these themes in the News Lab -- disagreement, collaboration, learning paradigms, and self-confidence-- provide continuums for tracing the

assimilation of student journalists into this journalism community and to an extent the larger journalism community. Also, the analysis of conference dialogue and participant interviews suggests some key factors that lead to higher levels of constructive activity and negotiation. Those include:

- Interest and personal involvement in a story
- The degree of experience in journalism
- The degree of experience in the world of work
- One's interpretation of disagreement
- Interpretation of the appropriate roles in the Lab
- Confidence
- Amount of time/energy spent on story and degree of deadline pressure
- Conflicting views of intent, angle, or focus for story

The comparison of Alex and Elaine within this cultural framework suggests that the context for negotiation is a complex interaction of these social and cognitive factors. Alex, an experienced student reporter, accepted negotiation of his story as a natural part of his relationship with Marjorie; whereas, Elaine, an inexperienced yet self-confident reporter, saw negotiation as a defense of her story, a stance which she had not experienced before. While there are differing views of negotiation among participants in the study, negotiation does occur and facilitates the verbalization of alternate text choices, the development of self-confidence, the socialization of the reporter into the journalism community, and the joint discovery of text solutions and meanings.

Reflecting on the Lab

Journalism educators have written extensively about the importance of revision and methods for teaching revision in journalism classrooms (Fischer & Grusin, 1993; Hresan, 1992; Smith, 1993; Yoder, 1993). But few have addressed the news lab culture as a powerful learning environment for enacting the global restructuring of text. This culture provides an authentic context for construction of journalistic concepts and skills, including the processes of collaboration, negotiation, and revision. In order for practitioners to effectively incorporate editorial conference collaboration into their routines, however, they need to understand the complex interpretations that students may bring to these dialogues and the patterns of interaction that facilitate learning.

One way to address these interpretations is through reflective dialogue with the class about the culture and the roles learners play. By assessing the assumptions and beliefs of all participants in a risk-free environment, class members can examine the

prior understandings they bring to the class-- their reactions to comments on their drafts, their view of the writing process, their preconceived ideas about editors and reporters, the views of collaboration and negotiation, and the factors that build self-confidence. As the class proceeds, these topics need to be open for discussion to build a metacognitive awareness of the social nature of writing, the evolving relationships within the class, and each students' development. Discussion should also facilitate student awareness of the different levels of revision-- revision for style as well as global structure and ideas. It may be that as students learn to automate style revisions (Irby, 1992a), they and the editor will focus more on issues of content and organization, issues that lend themselves more to collaboration and negotiation. Hopefully, such an awareness would help students progress from seeing editor comments as signs of weakness to seeing those comments as steps in a collaborative dialogue. Such a dialogue facilitates their socialization into the values, behaviors, and knowledge of the culture and empowers them to have a voice in the community's discourse.

Class discussion can also address the patterns of talk in conferences so that students understand that their verbalization of rationales for text choices helps them construct and reconstruct journalistic principles and develop their ability to apply those principles and to solve complex problems (Vygotsky, 1978; Gere & Abbott, 1985; Schon, 1983). In addition, multiple viewpoints, sometimes interpreted as disagreement, argument, or conflict can be viewed as a benefit in the learning and production process. If educators and students understand the collaborative nature of revision in the Lab, they can begin to appreciate the alternative solutions that emerge from negotiation and work through dialogues which are stuck on extended disagreements. Educators also need to examine their teaching strategies to find a balance between teacher presentations about revision and student experimentation with alternative text choices.

While this interpretation of editorial conferences in one university news lab is a beginning for understanding the writing process in this context, the two case studies developed here were limited to students who actively negotiated text. Further case studies are needed of students who are weak in their basic writing skills, who are lacking in self-confidence, or who do not negotiate. Continued research in this area should also address gender issues to see if women are more reluctant than men to negotiate with editors in this setting.

At the End of the Dialogue

In the dialogue with her editor, Elaine imagines what recourse those neighbors really have if they are frustrated with a person whose property is a health hazard. Then Marjorie counters with another viewpoint. In the process they discover together a confusion in the story that needs to be clarified, and Elaine adds two paragraphs before the story goes out the next day.

> If the owner fails to reimburse the city, a lien is placed on his or her property. The land owner must pay the property tax within three years or face foreclosure.
>
> **Residents of NW 59th Street have watched helplessly for two decades as Lynch's property went through this cycle time and again. The trash built up, and the city workers hauled it away. Lynch paid his fines, and gradually, the trash would return.**
>
> **Lynch's neighbors chose not to file a civil lawsuit against him for his repeated violation of city ordinances, but that option was available to them. If neighborhood residents wanted monetary compensation from Harris, they would need to hire an attorney and file a lawsuit in civil court.**
>
> (Final draft of 'Neighbor Trashes Neighborhood', 3/9/93)

Elaine and Marjorie have enacted the collaborative process which includes negotiation, resulting in revisions of a story for publication. They do this by verbalizing their different ideas, by asking questions, by making suggestions, and by tacitly agreeing on solutions.

"What students in the Lab learn is that writing is somewhat of a collaborative process. It's just putting two brains together that you come up with a better product." (Marjorie Interview, p. 30)

References

Anson, C. M., & Forsberg, L. L. (1990). Moving beyond the academic community. Written Communication, 7(2), 200-231.

Bartholomae, D., & Petrosky, A. (1986). Facts, artifacts, and counterfacts: theory and method for a reading and writing course. Portsmouth, N. H.: Heinemann.

Berlin, J. A. (1987). Rhetoric and reality writing instruction in American colleges, 1900-1985. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Burnett, R. (1991) Conflict in the collaborative planning of co-authors: How substantive conflict, representation of task, and dominance relate to high-quality documents. Carnegie-Mellon University.

Chan, C. K., Scardamalia, M., & Bereiter, C. (1992). Constructive activity in learning from text. American Educational Research Journal, 29(1), 97-118.

Clark, H. H. (1985). Language use and language users. In E. Aronson (Eds.), Handbook of social psychology (pp. 179-231). New York: Random House.

Clark, R., & Fry, D. (1992). Coaching writers. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Ede, L., & Lunsford, A. (1990). Singular texts/plural authors: Perspectives on collaborative writing. Carbondale, Ill: Southern Illinois University Press.

Englert, C. S., Raphael, T. E., Anderson, L. M., Anthony, H. M., & Stevens, D. D. (1991). Making strategies and self-talk visible: Writing instruction in regular and special education classrooms. American Educational Research Journal, 28(2), 337-372.

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In Wittrock (Eds.), Handbook of Research on Teaching (pp. 119-145). New York: MacMillan.

Fischer, R., & Grusin, E. K. (1993). Grammar Checkers: Programs That May Not Enhance Learning. Journalism Educator, 47(4), 20-27.

Fox, T. (1990). The Social Uses of Writing. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Freire, P. (1973). Education for critical consciousness. New York: Continuum.

Gere, A. R., & Abbott, R. D. (1985). Talking about writing: The language of writing groups. Research in the Teaching of English, 19, 362-379.

Giles, R. H. (1987). Newsroom management: A guide to theory and practice. Indianapolis, Indiana: R. J. Berg and Company.

Grow, G. (1991). Higher-order skills for professional practice and self-direction. Journalism Educator, 45(4), 56-65.

Hayes, J. R., & Flower, L. S. (1980). Identifying the organization of the writing process. In L. W. Gregg & E. R. Steinberg (Eds.), Cognitive processes in writing Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.

Hresan, S. L. (1992). Process method of teaching the news writing class. Journalism Educator, 46(4), 61-65.

Irby, J. (1992a) Creating the culture of journalism. Paper presented at AEJMC convention, Montreal.

Irby, J. (1992b). Negotiating text in a journalism discourse community: Your way plus my way equals our way Unpublished research paper. University of Washington.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1979). Conflict in the classroom: Controversy and learning. Review of Educational Research, 49(1), 51-70.

Johnstone, J. W. C., Slawski, E. J., & Bowman, W. W. (1976). The news people. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.

Lee, A. M. (1937). The Daily Newspaper in America. New York: MacMillan.

Nystrand, M., Greene, S., & Wiemelt, J. (1992). Where did Composition Studies Come From? An Intellectual History. Madison, Wisconsin: Center on School Organization and Restructuring, Wisconsin Center for Education Research.

Onore, C. (1989). The student, the teacher and the text: Negotiating meanings through response and revision. In C. A. Anson (Eds.), Writing and response: Theory, practice and research (pp. 231- 260). Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English.

Paul, R. W. (1987). Dialogical thinking: Critical thought essential to the acquisition of rational knowledge and passions. In J. B. Baron & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), Teaching thinking skills: Theory and Practice New York: W. H. Freeman.

Pettigrew, J., Shaw, R. A., & Van Nostrand, A. D. (1981). Collaborative analysis of writing instruction. Research in the Teaching of English, 15(4), 329-341.

Scardamalia, M., & Bereiter, C. (1987). Knowledge telling and knowledge transforming in written composition. In S. Rosenberg (Ed.) Advances in applied psycholinguistics, 2 New York: Cambridge.

Scardamalia, M., Bereiter, C., & Steinbach, R. (1984). Teachability of reflective processes in written composition. Cognitive Science, 8, 173-190.

Schon, D. A. (1983). The reflective practitioner. New York: Basic Books.

Schwegler, R. A. (1991a). "The Politics of Reading Student Papers." In R. Bullock, J. Trimbur, & C. Schuster (Eds.), The Politics of Writing Instruction: Postsecondary (pp. 203- 225). Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.

Shulman, L. (1992). Toward a pedagogy of cases. In J. Shulman (Ed.), Case Methods in Teacher Education New York: Teachers College Press.

Sinclair, J., & M., C. R. (1978). Towards an analysis of discourse: English used by teachers and pupils. Oxford: University Press.

Smith, W. E. (1993). Computers vs. paper in delivering news story rewrite advice. Journalism Educator, 48(1), 52- 58.

Spradley, J. P. (1980). Participant observation. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind and society: The development of higher psychological processes (Cole, M.John-Steiner, V.Scribner, S. Souberman, E, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Weaver, D. H., & Wilhoit, G. C. (1986). The American journalist. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Webb, N. M. (1982). Student interaction and learning in small groups. Review of Educational Research, 52(3), 421-445.

Yoder, S. L. (1993). Teaching Writing Revision: Attitudes and Copy Changes. Journalism Educator, 47(4), 41-47.

Appendix A

Categories of Talk-

1. **Questioning**
   - A. Editor/Adviser
     1. Elicits information
     2. Requests action
   - B. Reporter
     1. Requests elaboration on comment
     2. Asks for consultation on changes or plans
     3. Asks about procedure
     4. Counter with opposing, contrasting concept, claim, evidence, rationale

2. **Responding** - Fulfills expectation of questioning move or cursor move on computer

3. **Reacting** - Not directly elicited

Any of the following could be responding or reacting

1. Share information and explain rationale- apply journalistic principles
2. Modify text- compose, invent, clarify, synthesize, present, extend, suggest.
3. Counter- presenting opposing, contrasting concept or claim, rationale.
4. Give directive- make request, give rationale
5. Make change and give rationale
6. Echo- repeat, approve, agree with concept, claim, evidence.
7. Commit to action